



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,973	04/09/2004	Tomoyoshi Nagawa	2004-0568A	9537
513 7590 12/21/2007 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			EXAMINER CHEN, YI	
			ART UNIT 4152	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/820,973

Applicant(s)

NAGAWA ET AL.

Examiner

YI CHEN

Art Unit

4152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/9/2004.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made o a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, and 16-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hegli et al., (US 6606659 B1), hereinafter Hegli, in view of Emens et al., (US 6493744 B1), hereinafter Emens.

4. Regarding claim 1, Hegli discloses an access control apparatus for restricting access from at least one terminal on a network to a Website on the Internet, (Col 1, line 60-67, Col 2, line 1-3), comprising:

source data obtaining means for obtaining source data necessary for displaying a Web page by accessing a Website corresponding to a URI when the URI is received from the terminal, (Col 3, line 41-50; it is inherent to obtain source data if the user can access an internet site).

Art Unit: 4152

access restriction determination means for determining whether or not access to a Website corresponding to a link destination URI linked to the source data obtained by the source data obtaining means is restricted, (Col 4, line 63-67, Col 5, line 1-9);

restriction source data obtaining/storing means for obtaining source data necessary for displaying a Web page from an access-restricted Website, (Col 5, line 22-35), and storing the obtained source data as restriction source data if determination is made by the access restriction determination means that access to the Website corresponding to the link destination URI is restricted, (Col 4, line 63-67, Col 5, line 1-9);

rewritten source data generating/transmitting means for generating rewritten source data by rewriting the source data of the Website, for which determination is made by the access restriction determination means that access thereto is restricted, so as to obtain the restriction source data, and transmitting the rewritten source data to the terminal, (Col 12, line 16-25);

Hegli doesn't disclose image data obtaining means for obtaining image data designated in the restriction source data obtained by the restriction source data obtaining/storing means; unoffending image generating means for generating unoffending image data by converting the image data obtained by the image data obtaining means; unoffending image transmitting means for transmitting the restriction source data and the unoffending image data to the terminal if a link to the restriction source data is requested by the terminal.

Art Unit: 4152

In the same field of endeavor, Emens discloses image data obtaining means for obtaining image data designated in the restriction source data obtained by the restriction source data obtaining/storing means, (Col 4, line 12-15);

unoffending image generating means for generating unoffending image data by converting the image data obtained by the image data obtaining means, (Col 4, line 14-16);

unoffending image transmitting means for transmitting the restriction source data and the unoffending image data to the terminal if a link to the restriction source data is requested by the terminal, (Col 4, line 1-22).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hegli and the teachings of Emens to create an access control apparatus, which can generate unoffending image data by converting the image data, so that at least a portion thereof is hidden from view.

5. Regarding claim 2, Hegli discloses the rewritten source data generating/transmitting means generates rewritten source data describing access restriction to the Website for which determination is made by the access restriction determination means that access thereto is restricted, (Col 12, line 16-25);

Art Unit: 4152

6. Regarding claim 3, Hegli discloses the rewritten source data generating/transmitting means generates rewritten source data describing a link destination URI corresponding to the Website for which determination is made by the access restriction determination means that access thereto is restricted, (Col 12, line 16-25)

7. Regarding claim 4, Hegli discloses prohibition determination means for determining whether or not access to the Website corresponding to the link destination URI is prohibited if determination is made by the access restriction determination means that access thereto is restricted, (Col 4, line 63-67, Col 5, line 1-35), wherein when determination is made by the prohibition determination means that access to the Website corresponding to the link destination URI is prohibited, the rewritten source data generating/transmitting means generates rewritten source data by rewriting a description of the source data to disable a link to the Website, (Col 12, line 16-25).

8. Regarding claim 5, Hegli discloses the rewritten source data generating/transmitting means generates rewritten source data describing prohibition of access to the Website for which determination is made by the prohibition determination means that access thereto is prohibited, (Col 12, line 16-25);

Art Unit: 4152

9. Regarding claim 16, Hegli discloses disagreement notification instruction describing means for describing an instruction, in the restriction source data, for causing the terminal to transmit a disagreement notification indicating that the user disagrees with the determination that access is restricted, (Col 18, line 22-44, Fig 12); and restriction cancel source data transmitting means for obtaining source data and image data necessary for displaying a Web page from the access-restricted Website, when the disagreement notification transmitted from the terminal is received, and transmitting the obtained data to the terminal, (Col 18, line 36-44, Fig 12).

10. Regarding claim 17, Hegli discloses notification URI regulation determination means for determining whether or not the Website corresponding to the URI received from the terminal is a tentative inappropriate Website, (Fig 12, Col 18, line 22-35); and tentative inappropriateness notification source data generating/transmitting means for generating tentative inappropriateness notification source data describing a link to the restriction source data if determination is made by the notification URI regulation determination means that the Website corresponding to the URI is a tentative inappropriate Website, and transmitting the generated data to the terminal. (Col 12, line 16-25)

11. Regarding claim 18, Hegli discloses the tentative inappropriateness notification source data generating/transmitting means generates tentative inappropriateness notification source data describing access restriction to the

Art Unit: 4152

Website determined as a tentative inappropriate Website by the notification URI regulation determination means, (Fig 12, Col 18, line 22-35, Col 12, line 16-25)

12. Regarding claim 19, Hegli discloses the tentative inappropriateness notification source data generating/transmitting means generates tentative inappropriateness notification source data describing a link destination URI corresponding to the Website determined as a tentative inappropriate Website by the notification URI regulation determination means. (Fig 12, Col 12, line 16-25, Col 18, line 22-35)

13. Regarding claim 20, Hegli notification URI prohibition determination means for determining whether or not a Website corresponding to the URI received from the terminal is an inappropriate Website to which access prohibition is applied, (Col 12, line 16-25, Col 18, line 22-35); and inappropriateness notification source data generating/transmitting means for generating inappropriateness notification source data describing access prohibition to the Website corresponding to the URI if determination is made by the notification URI prohibition determination means that the Website corresponding to the URI is an inappropriate Website, and transmitting the generated data to the terminal. (Col 12, line 16-25).

14. Regarding claim 21, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Emens discloses the unoffending image generating means

Art Unit: 4152

generates unoffending image data by converting the image data so that at least a portion thereof is hidden from view. (Col 4, line 14-16).

15. Regarding claim 22, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Emens discloses the unoffending image generating means generates unoffending image data by changing a color, (black rectangle, Col 6, line 57), of an image on the Web page. (Col 6, line 46-63).

16. Regarding claim 23, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Emens discloses the unoffending image generating means generates unoffending image data by changing a size, (rectangle, Col 6, line 57), of an image on the Web page. (Col 6, line 46-63).

17. Regarding claim 24, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Emens discloses the unoffending image generating means generates unoffending image data by changing an aspect ratio, (rectangle, Col 6, line 57), of an image on the Web page. (Col 6, line 46-63).

18. Regarding claim 25, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Emens discloses the unoffending image generating means generates unoffending image data by dividing an image on the Web page into a plurality of parts, and arranging the divided parts at random, (Col 6, line 46-63).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 4152

the art to understand that the unoffending image generating can generate unoffending image data by changing an aspect ratio, color and size of an image. The unoffending image generating should also generate unoffending image data by dividing an image on the Web page into a plurality of parts, and arranging the divided parts at random.

19. Regarding claim 26, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Emens discloses the unoffending image generating means generates unoffending image data by converting an image on the Web page as if it was attached to a curved surface, (Col 6, line 46-63). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to understand that the unoffending image generating can generate unoffending image data by changing an aspect ratio, color and size of an image. The unoffending image generating should also generate unoffending image data by converting an image on the Web page as if it was attached to a curved surface.

20. Regarding claim 27, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, Emens discloses the unoffending image generating means generates an unoffending image by attaching a filter image having a blacked-out portion to an image on the Web page. (Col 6, line 46-63).

Art Unit: 4152

21. Claims 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hegli and Emens as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Klensin et al., (US 6564327 B1), hereinafter Klensin.

22. Regarding claim 6, Hegli and Emens disclose the claimed invention except the URI of the restricted Website is registered in a database, the apparatus further comprising: notification instruction describing means for describing an instruction, in the restriction source data, for causing the terminal to transmit an agreement determination notification indicating to what degree a user is able to agree with the determination that access is restricted; agreement result registration means for registering a content of the agreement determination notification, which is received from the terminal, as being associated with the URI of the restricted Website; and URI deleting means for deleting, from the database, a URI whose registration content registered by the agreement result registration means meets a predetermined condition.

Klensin discloses the URI of the restricted Website is registered in a database, (Col 8, line 14-42), the apparatus further comprising: notification instruction describing means for describing an instruction, (sends a list of sites for parental review, Col 8, line 15-18, Fig 6), in the restriction source data, for causing the terminal to transmit an agreement determination notification indicating to what degree, a user is able to agree with the determination that access is restricted, (parents can choose to block or unblock the web page, Col 8, line 14-42);

Art Unit: 4152

agreement result registration means for registering a content of the agreement determination notification, which is received from the terminal, as being associated with the URI of the restricted Website, (Col 8, line 23-27) ; and

URI deleting means for deleting, from the database, a URI whose registration content registered by the agreement result registration means meets a predetermined condition. (Col 8, line 25-29)

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hegli and Klensin and the teachings of Emens to create an access control apparatus, which a user can delete an appropriate website from the database and the apparatus can automatically customize the database.

23. Regarding claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 6 above, in addition, Emans discloses the predetermined condition is that agreement determination is performed more than a predetermined number of times, (the predetermined condition is voted by more than one user, Col 1, line 43-67, Col 2, line 1-3), and a number of points added by users disagreeing with the determination is greater than a number of points added by users agreeing with the determination, (Col 1, line 43-67, Col 2, line 1-3). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to understand that a third party determines a web site is appropriate based on comparing the voting numbers between appropriate and inappropriate.

Art Unit: 4152

24. Regarding claims 8, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7 above, in addition, Emans discloses the predetermine number of times is set for each URI. (Col 7, line 62-67).

25. Regarding claims 9, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 6 and 7 above. In addition, Emens discloses initial values are previously set as the number of points added by users disagreeing with the determination and/or the number of points added by users agreeing with the determination. (Col 7, line 62-67, Col 8, line 1-19)

26. Regarding claim 10, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 6 and 7 above. In addition, Emens discloses except the agreement result registration means assigns a weight to each user to change a number of points of agreement determination depending on the user. (Col 7, line 10-15).

27. Regarding claim 11, Hegli and Emens disclose the claimed invention except the URI of the restricted Website is registered in a database, the apparatus further comprising: notification instruction describing means for describing an instruction, in the restriction source data, for causing the terminal to transmit an agreement determination notification indicating to what degree the user is able to agree with the determination that access is restricted; agreement result registration means for registering a content of the agreement determination notification, which is received from the terminal, as being associated with the URI

Art Unit: 4152

of the restricted Website; and inappropriateness permanently-registration means for permanently registering a URI whose registration content registered by the agreement result registration means meets a predetermine condition in the database as a URI indicating an inappropriate Website.

Klensin discloses the URI of the restricted Website is registered in a database, (Col 8, line 14-42), the apparatus further comprising: notification instruction describing means for describing an instruction, (sends a list of sites for parental review, Col 8, line 15-18, Fig 6), in the restriction source data, for causing the terminal to transmit an agreement determination notification indicating to what degree, a user is able to agree with the determination that access is restricted, (parents can choose to block or unblock the web page, Col 8, line 14-42);

agreement result registration means for registering a content of the agreement determination notification, which is received from the terminal, as being associated with the URI of the restricted Website, (Col 8, line 23-27) ; and inappropriateness permanently-registration means for permanently registering a URI whose registration content registered by the agreement result registration means meets a predetermine condition in the database as a URI indicating an inappropriate Website. (Col 8, line 14-29)

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hegli and Klensin and the teachings of Emens to create an access control apparatus, which a user can register an

Art Unit: 4152

inappropriate website to the database and the apparatus can automatically customize the database.

28. Regarding claim 12, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 11 above, in addition, Emans discloses the predetermined condition is that agreement determination is performed more than a predetermined number of times, (the predetermined condition is voted by more than one user, Col 1, line 43-67, Col 2, line 1-3), and a number of points added by users agreeing with the determination is greater than a number of points added by users disagreeing with the determination, (Col 1, line 43-67, Col 2, line 1-3). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to understand that a third party determines a web site is appropriate based on comparing the voting numbers between appropriate and inappropriate.

29. Regarding claims 13, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12 above, in addition, Emans discloses the predetermine number of times is set for each URI. (Col 7, line 62-67)

30. Regarding claims 14, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12 above. In addition, Emens discloses initial values are previously set as the number of points added by users disagreeing with the determination and/or the number of points added by users agreeing with the determination. (Col 7, line 62-67, Col 8, line 1-19).

31. Regarding claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12 above. In addition, Emens discloses except the agreement result registration means assigns a weight to each user to change a number of points of agreement determination depending on the user. (Col 7, line 10-15).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YI CHEN whose telephone number is (571)270-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nabil Elhady can be reached on 571-272-3963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Art Unit: 4152

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Yi Chen
12/11/2007

~~/Nabil El-Hady/~~
~~Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4152~~


NABIL M. EL-HADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER